

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Advisory Action dated May 17, 2007, where the Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-24. In the present amendment, claims 1, 8, 9, 13, 16-18, 20, and 23-24 have been amended and claim 25 is new. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 being the independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-24 and new claim 25 in view of the amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

A. Criss Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 8, 13, or 20

The Advisory Action maintains the rejection of the independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20. The Examiner cites Criss for the proposition that it teaches receiving an end of session indicator from the network, namely using an FTP protocol. The Examiner states that the FTP protocol runs over TCP, which uses a number of end of session identifiers (such as the FTP 226 and 426 response codes). The Examiner further states that Criss is configured to detect an end of session indicator sent by the network, such as a TCP close connection, which "are not necessarily requested, but indicators in response to a particular condition (e.g., bad connection)." Applicant asserts that claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 (and their respective dependent claims) are patentable over Criss as follows.

Criss discloses that a mobile unit initiates a file transfer request by sending a File Request Packet to an FTP server. The mobile unit then determines if it received the files within a predetermined amount of time. If it received the files, then it stores the

files. If it did not receive the files then it retransmits the same file request. (Criss, Paragraph 0087). If after five times, the file is still not received, the processor allows the mobile device to continue operating with a prior version of software that the above process was attempting to update. (Criss, Paragraph 0087).

Criss does not teach or suggest the present claims for several reasons. First, the end of session identifier in the present claims is an expected end of session identifier that is received without a prior request. As paragraph 0087 of Criss shows, the described FTP exchange requires the mobile device to send at least five prior requests for the packet before it gives up and continues operating with the old version of the software.

Moreover, the Examiner has cited the "bad connection" indicators in TCP to read on the presently claimed expected end of session identifier, but a bad connection indication is not expected by a mobile device. In fact, a typical mobile device expects to operate normally and only upon a fault condition or other unexpected error will the bad connection indicator be sent. In that regard, the FTP 226 and 426 response codes cited on page 3 of the Advisory Action are not "expected" end of session identifiers because they happen in unusual and unanticipated circumstances (e.g., line down, system error, bad weather, etc).

Furthermore, the expected end of session identifier is further limited in the fact that in all of the claims in some way or another, its receipt has the effect of terminating the OTA programming call. On the contrary, in paragraph 0087 of Criss, the lack of the FTP response "allows the mobile terminal 36 to continue to operate with the existing version of software therein." As such, the response in Criss is not an end of session

identifier, but merely a response within the context of a continuing session. Hence, Criss is not teaching an expected end of session identifier because the lack of receipt of such a message and/or the timeout after five prior requests for the message causes the mobile device to continue to operate (not end a session). On the other hand, the expected end of session identifier as presently claimed has the opposite effect, which is to close the channel, terminate the call, or otherwise end the session.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the claims are presently in condition for allowance and a notice of allowance for independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 and their respective dependent claims is respectfully requested.

B. New Claim 25

New Claim 25 is in a condition for allowance for at least the reasons cited in subsection A. Moreover, new claim 25 states that the expected end of session indicator is expected to be detected without a prior request sent via the antenna or without an occurrence of a fault condition. As such, new claim 25 additionally distinguishes the expected end of session identifier from the FTP 226 and FTP 426 response codes cited on page 3 of the advisory Action because the response codes are sent in the case of a fault condition.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that new claim 25 is presently in condition for allowance and a notice of allowance for new claim 25 is respectfully requested.

C. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, an early allowance of claims 1-24 pending in the present application and new claim 25 is respectfully requested. If necessary, applicant requests, under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application and to charge the fees for a large entity under 37 CFR 1.17(a). The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) or credit any overpayment(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-3001 of Kyocera Wireless Corp.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 14, 2007

/George W. Luckhardt/
George W. Luckhardt
Reg. No. 50,519

George W. Luckhardt
KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.
Attn: Patent Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Tel: (858) 882-2593
Fax: (858) 882-2485